

Joint Special Field Meeting
Architectural and Site Control Commission and Planning Commission
16 Redberry Ridge, Borders **November 14, 2005**

ASCC Chair Chase and Planning Commission Chair McIntosh called the special joint field meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. at 16 Redberry Ridge. It was noted that this meeting was for the purposes of preliminary consideration of conditions associated with the Borders architectural review and site development permit (X9H-545) applications for the subject Blue Oaks property.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr
Planning Commission: McIntosh, McKetterick, Wengert, Zaffaroni
Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic

Others* present relative to the Borders project:

Louis Borders, applicant
Brooks Walker, project architect
Sharon Okada, project architect
Todd Cole, project landscape architect
Anne Amundsen, project landscape architect
Ellen Vernazza, Trails Committee
Steve Helpirn, 12 Hawk View
Linda** and Jerry Elkind, 14 Hawk View
Kirke Comstock, 9 Coalmine View
Louise Ringo, 199 Brookside Drive
Ted Vian, Mita Jones and Angela Siddel, Portola Valley Ranch Design Committee
Pierre Fischer, 10 Valley Oak
David Rock, 4 Franciscan Ridge

*This is a partial list. Others were present during portions of the site meeting, but not all were identified for the record.

**Linda Elkind, although a planning commissioner member, had previously advised she and her property could be impacted by the project and, therefore, she would not participate as a planning commissioner in review of the site development permit. She also explained that the town attorney advised her she could comment on the proposal as a potentially impacted property owner.

Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-545, 16 Redberry Ridge (Lot 16 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Borders

Vlastic presented the November 11, 2005 staff report on these applications, requested in support of plans for new residential development of the subject vacant Blue Oaks property. He advised that this would be a preliminary review for both the ASCC and planning commission and that comments and input from the meeting would be used by the project design team and town staff in continuing work on processing of the applications. Vlastic explained that the plans call for 2,797 cubic yards of grading to cut the proposed 6,006 sf house into the site and develop a lower level basement and terrace area that would also accommodate a desired swimming pool. He discussed interaction with the Portola Valley

Ranch design committee and also noted that the site meeting would include visits to at least two locations in Portola Valley Ranch to evaluate potential view impacts.

Brooks Walker and other project design team members presented the following plans and materials dated 10/21/05 and, unless otherwise noted, prepared by Walker Warner Architects:

Sheet A01.1, Cover Sheet

Civil Engineering Drawings, prepared by Luzuriaga, Taylor, Inc.

Sheet C0-0, Title Sheet

Sheet C1.1, Grading Plan

Sheet C2.1, Utility Plan

Sheet EX-1, Earthwork Quantities

Landscape Drawings, prepared by Suzman & Cole

Sheet L-0.1, Site Plan

Sheet L-2.0, Grading Plan

Architectural Drawings

Sheet A1.1, Site Plan

Sheet A2.0a, Basement Plan - Area Calculation

Sheet A2.0b, Basement Plan - Area Calculation

Sheet A2.1, First Floor Plan

Sheet A2.2, Basement Plan

Sheet A3.1, Exterior Elevations

Sheet A4.1, Building Sections

Sheet A4.2, Building Sections

Sheet ME2.1, First Floor Exterior Lighting Plan

Sheet ME2.2, Basement Exterior Lighting Plan

Also reviewed were the proposed colors and materials board as well as samples of the proposed exterior materials, including roof tile. The following comments and clarifications were offered by design team members:

- The Blue Oaks PUD provisions are very limiting as are site conditions. A great deal of effort was needed to ensure the plans conform to the PUD provisions and meet the needs of the property owners.
- Two renderings of the project were presented. One provided a view to the southeast side of the residence, i.e., from the entry auto court, and the other was to the two level northeast facing house elevation. Also presented was a project model.
- The story poles and taping set for the site meeting were identified. It was noted the information included the house footprint, the driveway alignment, house roof forms and the terrace and pool area. It was explained that the roof poles and taping extended to the end of the eaves and actually suggested more volume than is proposed because the house walls would be set back from the eaves.

- It was noted that based on site inspection with staff, a detailed plan of the location of the old manzanita plants on the site had been prepared and that this data was being incorporated into the landscape plan with the hope of saving as many of the plantings as possible out side of the proposed construction area. It was also noted that it might be possible to make some adjustments to the approach to grading to save more of the older plants. At the same time, it was pointed out that most of the larger, older plants are actually well beyond the building envelope and many are not even on Lot 16.
- It was stated that in response to preliminary planning commission review comments, the limits of the proposed graded areas were taped and the tape alignments were pointed out and explained. It was suggested that the fill area proposed below the planned swimming pool might be eliminated with the addition of a low seat wall along the north side of the pool. It was also noted that the proposed pool equipment facility would be moved to a less exposed location, likely on the west side of the pool terrace.
- It was noted that more research effort is underway relative to the color for the proposed exterior stucco, and the proposed stone siding material. It was explained that potential view impacts are fully appreciated and the desire is to identify colors and materials that will ensure harmony with site colors and conditions.

All those present walked the site to better appreciate the plans, and potential impacts on site conditions. Neighbors from Portola Valley Ranch, including members of the Ranch design committee pointed out view relationships and potential impacts. Concerns were expressed over the size of the project, vegetation impacts, ability to plant screen vegetation on the site and evening time light spill from windows and exterior light fixtures.

After obtaining an appreciation of site conditions and understanding the project, ASCC members, planning commission members, the project design team, town staff and several others drove to 22 Sandstone, 6 Horseshoe Bend and 14 Hawk View to consider view relationships from these areas in Portola Valley Ranch. Views were considered from the end of Sandstone, just above the house at 22 Sandstone. In addition, views were considered from the south facing decks of the houses at 6 Horseshoe Bend and 14 Valley Oak. During visits to these locations, a series of photos provided by Vlasic were considered showing views to and from the project site at varying focal lengths, including 45 mm, 112 mm and, from 6 Horseshoe Bend, at 320 mm. During the course of these inspections the following were noted:

- From town topographic data it appears that most locations in the Ranch are at a lower elevation than the 850 foot level of the proposed swimming pool terrace. It is possible, however, that the upper deck on the house at 6 Horseshoe Bend, due to the height of the house and deck, may have a view from a height that is closer to the height of the pool terrace. This was, however, not fully clear from the topographic data that are available.
- Colors and finishes of the proposed improvements will be critically important in control of potential view impacts. Also, control of light spill will be important in terms of nighttime view impacts.
- Vlasic noted that the Borders parcel, as well as others at the end of Redberry Ridge, were initially approved as building sites in 1988 with the Portola Glen Estates project. He

added that when these "upper" Portola Glen Estates properties were included in Blue Oaks in 1998, the development limitations on them, including floor area and height limits, were further reduced.

- Pierre Fischer pointed out that views should not only be considered from the decks of houses, but also the public streets within the Ranch and general area. Vlasic referred to photos taken from Valley Oak looking up to Blue Oaks Lots 16 and 17 showing the story poles and views to the existing Owens house on Lot 17 and encouraged ASCC and planning commissioners to drive along Valley Oaks to also see the views.

At the conclusion of the site meeting, ASCC members and planning commissioners thanked the applicant and project architects for the opportunity to better understand site conditions and constraints. They also thanked the Ranch neighbors for their input and ability to visit Ranch locations. Further, ASCC members concluded that discussion of the project should continue at the regular evening ASCC meeting. Planning Commissioners were encouraged to provide written comments they may have based on inspection of site conditions that could be used by the applicant and staff as project processing work continues.

Adjournment

At approximately 5:10 p.m. the field meeting was adjourned.

Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

ASCC: Chase, Breen, Gelpi, Schilling, Warr

Absent: None

Town Council Liaison: Merk

Planning Commission Liaison: McIntosh

Town Staff: Deputy Town Planner Vlastic, Planning Manager Lambert

Oral Communications

Oral communications were requested, but none were offered.

Review of site development permit X9H-541, for swimming pool and other site improvements, 165 Fawn Lane, Kloezeman

Vlastic presented the November 10, 2005 staff report on this request and noted that the ASCC last considered this matter at its October 24 meeting and continued review to the November 14 meeting. He then reviewed the following plans and materials dated November 9, 2005, prepared by project landscape architect, Matthew Kennedy in response to comments and concerns expressed at the October 24 meeting:

Letter explaining the plan revisions

Sheet MP-1, Landscape Master Plan

Sheet MP-2, Sections, Elevations and Drawings

Also presented were the cut sheets for the light fixtures identified on Sheet MP-1.

Vlastic noted that since preparation of the November 10 staff report, the town had received a letter from Mark FitzGerald, 155 Fawn Lane in support of the plans for the mound along the property line common with his parcel, but noting concerns over potential runoff and erosion.

Mr. and Mrs. Kloezeman and Matthew Kennedy, presented the revised plans to the ASCC and offered the following comments and clarifications:

- A sample of the proposed "Desert Sand" colored concrete was presented and found acceptable by ASCC members.
- The plans still provide for a somewhat "tropical" character of planting around the pool. The palm, however, has been removed from the plan.
- The proposed pool equipment pad has been relocated and will not impact the nearby oak. It is not desired to place the equipment in an underground vault, due to the cost, or under the deck because of potential noise impacts on the lower level living areas. The

equipment pad will be surrounded by a stucco-faced wall to control noise and in the proposed location it can be easily accessed for maintenance.

- The size of the play area on the east side of the property has been reduced in size and screen planting substantially increased. In response to a question, it was noted that the proposed larger 24-inch box oaks would be planted on either side of the 15-gallon oak.
- In response to a question, it was noted that the bottlebrush would be preserved, but had been "pruned" and there was some loss of plants that occurred when power lines were placed underground by PG&E.
- The Buckeye trees are still desired as a layer in the front yard screening. Existing plantings will be preserved that already provide for some screening of views to the play area from the street.

Public comments were requested. **Kent Mitchell, speaking on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Connelly, 175 Fawn Lane**, supported the plan revisions, but wondered about the need for replacing the Buckeye trees with an evergreen variety. He also supported the addition of fencing, for screening and privacy, as recommended in the staff report.

ASCC members discussed the revised plans and found them generally acceptable. Concerns were expressed over the ongoing impacts of the construction process and the need for better oversight of the site work. Members also concurred that with proper installation of the proposed plantings, in time screening would be accomplished and, for this reason, did not conclude fencing was needed for screening or privacy. It was noted however, that while the Garrya would be effective in screening, the installation size should be larger than the 5-gallon size specified on the plans.

Following discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0, approval of the revised plans subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of the grading permit or any building permit:

1. The landscape plan shall be revised to show the Garrya plantings as 15-gallon size.
2. An encroachment permit shall be requested and approved by the public works director prior to completion of any work or planting in the public right of way.
3. The landscaping plan shall be revised to define the pattern for the planting of the three oaks along the eastern property line as clarified at the ASCC meeting.
4. Details for the pool equipment enclosure shall be specified, and the surrounding walls shall have a maximum height of four feet.
5. Tree protection and other vegetation protective measures shall be fully in place, to the satisfaction of planning staff, before the start of work on the improvements proposed with this application.
6. All requirements of the public works director and town geologist shall be adhered to.

Prior to discussion of the following application, Warr temporarily removed himself from the ASCC meeting room, explaining his firm was providing the architectural services for the property immediately to the southwest of the Portside project site.

Architectural Review for New Residence, 167 Brookside Drive, Portside LLC

Vlasic presented the November 10, 2005 staff report on this follow-up submittal. He explained that the project was conditionally approved by the ASCC at its October 10, 2005 meeting and to address the conditions of approval, the applicant has submitted the following plans and materials, unless otherwise noted, dated November 1, 2005 and prepared by Scott K. Thrift, AIA:

- Sheet A 01, Cover Sheet
- Sheet A 02, Site Plan
- Sheet A 03, Survey, L. Wade Hammon, Licensed Land Surveyor
- Sheet A 04, Floor Plan (house)
- Sheet A 05, Exterior Elevation (house)
- Sheet A 06, Exterior Elevation (house)
- Sheet A 07, Garage /Studio (floor plan and elevations)
- Sheet A 08, Lighting (fixture cut sheets)
- Sheet A 09, Lighting Plan
- Sheet L-1, Layout Plan, Champion Stephens Design Group, 11/7/05
- Sheet L-2, Construction Details, Champion Stephens Design Group, 11/7/05
- Sheet L-3, Planting Plan, Champion Stephens Design Group, 11/7/05
- Sheet L-4, Planting Details, Champion Stephens Design Group, 11/7/05
- Sheet L-4, Planting Specifications, Champion Stephens Design Group, 11/7/05
- Sheet L-4, Maintenance Specifications, Champion Stephens Design Group, 11/7/05
- Sheet C1, Grading and Drainage Plan, Robert Lyon, Consulting Engineer, 11/9/05
- Sheet C2, Erosion Control Plan, Robert Lyon, Consulting Engineer, 11/9/05
- "Construction Management Guidelines" sheet, received November 10, 2005.

William Patterson and Scott Thrift presented the follow-up plans to the ASCC and indicated that the landscape plan, in particular, had been shared with the neighbor to the northeast. It was clarified that the planned tree removal is shown in detail on Sheet C1, not C2 as noted in the staff report.

Public comments were requested. **Annaloy Nickum, 171 Brookside Drive**, expressed some concern over how close to one another some of the plant materials were proposed to be installed, and their ability to thrive. She also expressed concern over the impacts of construction noise, including workers radios. She concluded by asking for a specific schedule for removal of the trees, as she wanted to conduct a proper ceremony for their loss.

Mr. Patterson indicated he would instruct his workers to adhere to the town's construction noise limits and ask that they limit the volume on any radios, etc. He also stated he would inform Ms. Nickum of the specific schedule for tree removal.

In response to a question from the ASCC, Richard Merk, neighbor at 171 Brookside Drive stated that the construction trailer and portable toilet could be located further toward Brookside Drive and be in the setback area and that such a location would have minimum impact on his property.

ASCC members found the follow-up submittal generally acceptable, but stressed the need for control of construction impacts and to keep the neighbors informed of the construction operations, particularly when there was any potential for impacts on traffic flow.

Mr. Patterson advised he was fully aware of and sensitive to construction issues and stressed that he should be contacted immediately by neighbors relative to any concerns or issues. He reminded everyone that his telephone number was on the "construction management guidelines sheet."

Following discussion, Schilling moved, seconded by Breen and passed 4-0 approval of the follow-up submittal subject to the following conditions to be addressed to the satisfaction of planning staff prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Sheet C2 shall be revised to locate the construction trailer and portable toilet away from the structures on the parcel to the northeast. They may be located within the side setback area, but shall be moved further toward Brookside Drive. Further, the plan shall be modified to show protection of the existing English Laurel plants until the conclusion of the construction operation.
2. Detail B on Sheet L-2, shall be corrected to show that the maximum height of the wire mesh fence as being four (4) feet.
3. At the pre-construction meeting, the contractor shall provide a detailed construction schedule, including the dates for tree removal. At the pre-construction meeting, the contractor shall also provide measures to be taken to control construction noise within the provisions of the town's noise ordinance. These measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of planning staff. Once approved by staff, copies of the construction schedule and construction management plan, including work hours consistent with the town's noise ordinance, shall be provided by letter to the area neighbors.
4. Details for the concrete truck "wash-out pit" shown on sheet C2 shall be provided to the satisfaction of the public works director.

In response to a question, Vlastic noted that the public works director would be completing a final review and approving the details for the drainage system pursuant to the normal building permit review process.

.....
Following discussion of the foregoing application, Warr returned to his ASCC position.
.....

Conditional Use Permit X7D-163, Alpine Road right of way near 3530 Alpine Road, T-Mobile

Vlasic presented the November 10, 2005 staff report on this conditional use permit application for installation and operation of antenna and associated equipment for the T-Mobile wireless services network. He explained that the improvements would be placed on an existing wood "joint" pole located within the town's right-of-way across the street from Alpine Rock Ranch at 3530 Alpine Road as shown on the five-sheet plan set dated 8/19/05 provided by T-Mobile/Pack Bell and clarified by the following project materials:

Coverage Map, with 9/20/05 transmittal letter from Aaron D. Estes
RF Exposure Analysis dated July 6, 2005, prepared by Hammett & Edison, Inc.

Vlasic noted that review of this proposal is for the purpose of formulating recommendations that the planning commission would consider in acting on the use permit application.

Public comments were requested, but none were offered. In response to a question from Chair Chase, Lambert advised that no one was present to represent the applicant.

After brief discussion, Gelpi moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0 to recommend planning commission approval of the project as presented subject to the existing and proposed equipment being painted in a brown color matching, as possible, the color of the existing joint pole. The action was taken with the understanding that the standard conditions relative to removal of the equipment should be part of any use permit approval action.

Architectural Review for new residence and Site Development Permit X9H-545, 16 Redberry Ridge (Lot 16 Blue Oaks Subdivision), Borders

Vlasic reviewed the comments in the November 10, 2005 staff report on these applications and discussed the afternoon site meeting with the planning commission. (See above site meeting minutes, which include a complete listing of the proposed project plans.) Vlasic reminded ASCC members that this was a preliminary review of the proposal and that comments should be developed to help the project design team consider possible changes and clarifications that appear needed before the ASCC would be prepared to consider any final actions.

Mr. Borders, Brooks Walker, Todd Cole and other members of the project team were present to receive input and offer clarifications regarding the project. In response to a question, Mr. Walker advised that significant efforts were made to design a project conforming to the provisions of the Blue Oaks PUD as well as other town ordinances and design guidelines. He stressed that every effort was made to avoid conflicts and any "variance" conditions. He added that at one point a higher roof pitch was considered for better harmony with the architectural character of the house, but this option was rejected because it would only be possible if a variance were granted. He added based on staff input, he appreciates the difficulty the town has with variances and, for this reason, concluded that approach would not be in the best interests of his clients or, therefore, the project.

Also in response to a question, Mr. Walker stated that the proposed plate heights were 9 feet, but were expressed more like 10-foot heights due to the construction required between the basement and upper floor level.

Public comments were requested and the following offered:

Ted Vian, 2 Sunhill, stated that while he is a member of the Ranch Design Committee, he was offering comments as an individual as the committee had yet to prepare a formal statement on project. He offered the following perspectives:

- When Blue Oaks was approved, the ASCC was given significant responsibility in the PUD statement to address the details of the designs for individual lot improvements.
- The current design efforts to cut the house into the hillside are appreciated, but additional efforts appear needed to address massing and potential visual impacts, including views back to the Redberry Ridge area from more distant locations like Palo Alto's Foothills Park.
- While the project appears to conform to the technical aspects of the PUD, the ASCC will need to carefully evaluate conformity to the more subjective design provisions and there appears to be three key areas of concern:

Visual impacts. Critical will be the selection of colors that blend with the natural site conditions to the maximum possible, though it is likely that the siding will need to be much darker than the native sandstone to minimize reflection and visibility. The colors and materials, including roofing, of the Jagger's house on Blue Oaks Court are successful in blending with the trees and minimizing reflection.

Night lighting. Light spill should be minimized from both internal as well as external light sources.

Landscaping. The older, larger manzanita should be protected to the maximum extent possible. Screening should be enhanced with additional plantings that create an unobtrusive flow across the site.

The final plan should ensure the project fits the site and greater community and is not one that is "imposed" upon it.

Linda Elkind, 14 Hawk View, reviewed the comments and concerns expressed in her November 9, 2005 letter to the ASCC and planning commission. She questioned the projects conformity to the Blue Oaks PUD provisions, scope of grading, project size and overall impact on the natural setting. She expressed concern over the pool location and pool use, and the need to control reflection and light spill. She suggested that the number of north facing windows be reduced. She also asked for more details on the planned construction staging operations.

Jerry Elkind, 14 Hawk View, also reviewed the comments in the November 9, 2005 letter to the ASCC and planning commission. He questioned if the plan conformed to the Stonecrest provisions of the Blue Oaks PUD and worried that the project would dominate the landscape. He also expressed concerns over colors, materials, landscaping, and impacts of the grading for the pool and pool terrace area. He offered his conclusion that the design did not conform to the guidelines of the PUD.

Pierre Fischer, 10 Valley Oak, stated he could not see the project site from his house, but was worried about the impact on views from the Valley Oak street. He expressed concerns over the visual impacts of the existing Owens house on Blue Oaks Lot 17 and asked that more landscaping be required to essentially hide views to the proposed house from off site, particularly the public streets and trails. He also suggested that the house height be reduced and that it be moved back on the site.

David Rock, 4 Franciscan Ridge, commented that the proposed building site and lot had been in existence for some time and that while the project will be visible from sites in the Ranch, it is appropriate given the history and background of Blue Oaks and Portola Glen Estates Projects. He added that he felt some of the Ranch residents were over reacting and not keeping the overall framework in perspective.

Mita Jones, Ranch Design Committee, expressed concern over project conformity to the design "principals" of the Blue Oaks PUD.

Diana Fischer, 10 Valley Oak, suggested that variances should be considered, particularly reduction in the requirements for off street parking, to allow the house to be moved further back on the site and better fit the building envelope.

Vlasic noted that in addition to the above comments, the ASCC had received a **November 14, 2005 letter from Stephen and Diana Halprin, 12 Hawk View** expressing concerns with the project.

Vlasic also commented that the form of the building envelope and off-street parking requirements, make it difficult to move the house back on the site and findings for any variances from these constraints would be extremely difficult to make.

After presentation of public comments, ASCC members offered the following comments and reactions:

Warr:

- This is a tough but wonderful site. The PUD sets considerable constraints and the EIR mandated the requirements for the nine off-street parking spaces. It may seem excessive, but it is realistic in terms of the pattern of use of larger parcels in town.
- Access is constrained by only a 40-foot frontage on the cul-de-sac bulb. The site's slope and limited frontage set the framework for access and needed grading.
- Colors, lighting and landscaping will be the critical issues with the project.
- The alternative suggestion offered at the site meeting for a seat wall to eliminate the need for fill below the pool terrace seems questionable. The fill has little potential for off site impacts and the fill for the pool terrace area helps screen views to the basement level.

- Over 900 sf of the basement level actually counts against the floor area limits. If the basement were eliminated it is likely that this floor area would be added to the lower part of the building envelope and the visual impacts would increase.
- More efforts appear needed including, perhaps increasing the grading, to further reduce views to the northeast, two level, elevation of the house.
- While the approach to the design seems good and generally in the right direction, some key problems are:
 - a. To better fit the site, grading for the project may need to extend beyond the building envelope.
 - b. The northeastern edge of the building envelope needs to be protected to protect the manzanita.
 - c. Consideration should be given to adding more fill in the pool and lawn area to facilitate the effectiveness of both fill and landscape screening to the lower level.
 - d. The formality of both the front and rear elevations need to be reduced. In particular, consideration should be given to only one stairway from the main level to the lower pool terrace, and this should have a more organic and less formal form.
 - e. Again, colors, lighting, landscaping and "glare" will be important issues that need to be resolved with the final plans.

Breen:

- Agree with comments offered by Warr.
- Control of exterior colors and light spill will be critical issues.
- Main issue is landscaping. Due to soils conditions, this is a difficult site for plants to grow and particularly to grow to heights that will be effective for screening of views. This needs to be addressed in landscape plan revisions and clarifications.
- The landscape plan needs to better reflect the landscape requirements of the Blue Oaks PUD and the proposed planting should stay within the approved plant palette.
- Chain link fencing should be used to protect the existing manzanita and the plans adjusted to preserve as much of the manzanita as possible, considering the constraints of the building envelope.
- Consideration should be given to reducing the scope of the pool terrace and lawn area.

Gelpi:

- This is a large house and the scale and mass with the stone veneer increase potential for visual impacts on the northeast side.

- Options to reduce potential impacts need to be considered. A complete review of the proposal against the Blue Oaks design criteria that apply to the lot should be provided showing how all have been accommodated.
- Agree with other comments re: colors, landscaping and lighting.

Schilling:

- This is a difficult parcel, but the only way to eliminate any potential for visual change and avoid impacts is to not build on it.
- Cutting the house into the site appears the right approach and the proposed grading approach is preferred to more retaining walls.
- It would be helpful to know what other design options were considered and rejected to get to this design. (Note: in response to this comment Brooks Walker discussed the roof pitch and other design issues in responses summarized above.)
- Overall, the design approach appears to be going in the right direction, but colors, materials, lighting and landscaping will be critical design factors.

Chase indicated concurrence with most of the comments offered by others and, in particular, advised that the project appears to be generally "headed in the right direction." She stressed that colors and materials would be critical as would be landscaping and lighting.

Some of the ASCC comments and issues were discussed with the project design team. Eventually, it was agreed that consideration should be given to more grading, i.e., particularly fill along the northern side of the house. There was concurrence that considerable dirt would be available from the basement excavation and that this material could be placed below the house to avoid off-haul and associated truck trips; and, more importantly, to:

- Reduce the height of the downhill terrace walls and shorten the apparent height relative to views along the two level, northeastern portion of the house.
- Build up the area along and even beyond the northern building envelope line to enhance opportunities for planting and screening of views from the north. It was noted that there are no open space easement constraints on the parcel so fill beyond the building envelope line is possible without the need for special actions or approvals if such fill is found appropriate to achieve PUD and town design objectives.
- Provide a better environment for plant growth than the native condition of the site's sandstone.
- Reduce the formality of the stair access from the upper terrace to the lower pool area. It was hoped that the stairs could be placed on the fill rather than the currently proposed more formal stone structures.

It was stressed by ASCC members that more fill should be used to reduce views to the two level portion of the house and the formality of the design in the pool terrace area.

At the conclusion of discussion, project review was continued to the regular November 28 ASCC meeting with the understanding that more time may be needed to evaluated and response to ASCC comments and directions.

Approval of Minutes

Warr moved, seconded by Breen and passed 5-0* approval of the October 24, 2005 field and evening meeting minutes with the following spelling corrections:

Page 5. In the second to last sentence of the first paragraph, change "were building permits" to "where building permits."

Page 5. In the middle of the first sentence in the second bullet item, change "way" to "why."

Page 6. In the middle of the second sentence in the second bullet item, change "loose" to "lose."

Page 7. At the start of the second paragraph, change "Mr." to "Ms."

*Warr advised, that his vote included abstentions with respect to the approval of the minutes relative to the Lefteroff project.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

T. Vlastic